## Purpose of Study

- Identify various types of institutions to be funded and appropriate funding mechanisms for participants

- Define appropriate metrics collection and monitoring mechanisms for reporting (publicizing) performance (accomplishments)

- Recommend, to Earth Science Enterprise, appropriate language for inclusion in various types of solicitations

## Schedule

Draft questions to send to sponsors and implementing organizations – January 4, 2002 *(completed)*

Community Workshop - February 5-7, 2002 *(completed)*

Refine questions and "visit list" - February 15, 2002 *(completed)*

Distribute questionnaires to "visit list" - March 8, 2002

Draft report on metrics planning and reporting as a function of "class" – April 1, 2002

Obtain responses and conduct follow-up interviews – March – May 2002

Preliminary report – June 30, 2002

Further contacts with sponsors and implementing organizations as needed - July - October 2002

Recommendations to ESE about metrics planning and reporting mechanisms - December 2002

## Approach

- Engage community through workshops and survey interviews

- Survey sponsoring and implementing organizations
  - Identify/Define "classes" of participants (e.g., types of ESIPs; Program and Project offices) and define reporting requirements
  - Survey existing mechanisms for metrics planning and reporting, and their pros and cons
  - Contact projects (e.g., HST, ESSP), ESIP federation members and other entities to learn about mechanisms being used
  - Obtain opinions of sponsoring organizations about metrics information they are getting (and missing)

- Identify metrics planning and reporting requirements for solicitations and funding instruments
  - Identify requirements mandated by the government (NPGs etc.) as appropriate to different classes of participants and dollar levels
  - Identify documentation requirements for different classes of participants (Grants, Working Agreements, Contracts, etc.)
  - Identify requirements/funding flow options for the different classes of participants

## Status

- Started task with SGT - 12/1/01

- Drafted survey questionnaire, letters, "visit list"

- Added 3 "community" participants to study team ("deep involvement") after February 2002 workshop

- Questionnaire ready to be sent to initial list of 26 respondents

- Reviewing NASA solicitations and funding instruments to prepare report on metrics planning and reporting as function of "class" of participants

March 5, 2002

## Community Workshop - February 5-7, 2002

❑ **~15 individuals attended breakout session on Metrics Planning and Reporting**

  ➢ **Representatives from HQ, DAACs, ESIPs and SEEDS team**

❑ **What we heard (highlights)**

  ➢ **General consensus: Current metrics only partially reflect a provider's performance, e.g., measures of utilization of data and products by science community and their value to society are currently not reflected in metrics collection**

  ➢ **Measuring "value" is important, but no good ways exist yet to do this**

  ➢ **Multiple viewpoints need to be considered for metrics planning and reporting depending on classes of participants (e.g., NASA HQ, Project sponsors, Data/Service providers, Provider internal organizations,End users)**

  ➢ **Questionnaire should include more direct questions that deal with accountability**

  ➢ **"Visit list" should include other organizations (e.g., NSF, DOE, LASP, Vexcel, financial community)**

  ➢ **Metrics collection offers an opportunity for corrective action, advertising and publicizing successes**

  ➢ **The study team should review the Federation's metrics processes and protocols as a body of lessons learned**

  ➢ **There is a potential for lack of data stewardship across entities in the SEEDS environment**

  ➢ **Governance, management, and authority in the "SEEDS era" have not been addressed**

## Post-Workshop Actions

❑ **Added 3 new participants to study team and have been "deeply involved" as a Focus Review team**

  ➢ Don Collins (DAAC Alliance), Manager, JPL PODAAC

  ➢ Frank Lindsay (Federation) - Manager, Global Land Cover Facility ESIP-2, University of Maryland

  ➢ Hank Wolf (Federation), Assistant Director of CEOSR, George Mason University, Member, Seasonal to Inter-annual ESIP-2 Project

❑ **Sent draft question list to above three (Focus Review Team) for review and comment, resulting in excellent feedback:**

  ➢ Current draft largely ignores direct questions on accountability

  ➢ Need to differentiate between a project's organization and its institutional organization – two very different views (e.g., task-reporting and administrative-reporting)

  ➢ To improve clarity and simplicity,  like questions should be grouped under their own headings, several questions should be merged and simplified, and several new questions are needed.

❑ **Revised question list based on feedback - expect to send to "initial visit list" of 26 organizations by March 8, 2002**

❑ **Developed a matrix of drivers for Success, Accountability and Value to reflect multiple viewpoints for the different classes of participants**